## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakinami and Okamoto

Claim 1 recites a drive assisting apparatus "wherein based upon a value of adjusting data of said locus data with respect to a typical steering angle, said display position adjusting amount setting means calculates, <u>during said setting operation</u>, values of adjusting data of said locus data with respect to all of other steering angles." During a subsequent <u>normal driving operation</u>, locus data corresponding to a detected steering angle is read out and a drive assisting image is produced based upon the adjusting data contained in the read locus data. In this way, during an initial "setting operation," adjusting data can be determined for a typical steering angle and then calculated for all other steering angles. The "setting operation" is an initial setup operation for determining the adjusting data. During the subsequent "normal driving operation," the adjusting data can be read out according to a determined steering angle and used to display the travel predicted locus on the image acquired by the on-vehicle camera.

Accordingly, claim 1 requires a setting operation that precedes a normal driving operation. In the setting operation, values of adjusting data with respect to all other steering angle are calculated based upon a value of adjusting data with respect to a typical steering angle. The Office action cites Kakinami at Fig. 7, col. 5, lines 5-19 and col. 6, lines 48-67 for teaching "the values of adjusting data area calculated and are with respect to steering angles." Figure 7 shows a camera calibration procedure to account for camera roll angle, tilt angle and pan angle.

Camera roll, tilt and pan angles have no relation to steering angle. Column 5, lines 5-19

discusses a normal driving operation, and not a preceding setting operation. Column 6, lines 48-

67 discuss the translation and rotation (i.e., tilt, pan and roll) components of the camera relative

to a standard coordinate system, and such components have no relation to steering angle.

Assume, arguendo, that Kakinami's teaches both a "setting operation" (e.g., camera

calibration) and a "driving operation subsequent to a setting operation." Kakinami merely

teaches to determine camera roll, tilt and pan angles during calibration, which have no relation to

steering angle. Accordingly, Kakinami fails to teach "based upon a value of adjusting data of

said locus data with respect to a typical steering angle, said display position adjusting amount

setting means calculates, during said setting operation, values of adjusting data of said locus

data with respect to all of other steering angles."

Kakinami's above-discussed deficiencies with respect to claim 1 are not corrected by

Okamoto. Furthermore, the claimed subject matter is directed to the use of a data table

containing both adjusting data and locus display data corresponding to steering angles in

producing a drive assisting image. During the normal driving operation, the locus display data

and adjusting data are read out of the data table according a detected steering angle. Neither

cited reference discloses a data table, let alone a data table containing both locus display data and

adjusting data. In view of the differences between the cited references and the claimed subject

matter, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable said references. Claims 2-5

depend from claim 1. The arguments provided above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claim

6, and applicant submits that claim 6 is also allowable over Okamoto.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in

condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

Page 3 of 4

Appln. No. 10/566,104 Amendment dated September 9, 2009 Reply to Office Action dated June 22, 2009

application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-39565.

Respectfully submitted, PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street Suite 1200 Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108 (216) 579-1700

Date: September 9, 2009